

#8844  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

**Case No.:** 2:23-cv-01298-JLS-BFM

**Date:** March 31, 2025

**Title:** Todd R.G. Hill v. Board of Directors of Peoples College of Law, et al.

=====  
Present: The Honorable Brianna Fuller Mircheff, United States Magistrate Judge

Christianna Howard  
Deputy Clerk

N/A  
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:  
N/A

Attorneys Present for Defendant:  
N/A

**Proceedings: (In Chambers) Orders on Pending Motions**

Pending before the Court are four Motions filed by Plaintiff. For the following reasons, each of those Motions are **denied**.

First, Plaintiff moves for leave to conduct discovery to establish “systemic inequities in legal education and licensure.” (ECF 241.) Under Rule 26(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, no party may seek discovery from any source before the Rule 26(f) conference, unless such discovery is authorized by court order. The Court may authorize early discovery upon a showing of good cause. *Semitoool, Inc. v. Tokyo Electron Am. Inc.*, 208 F.R.D. 273, 276 (N.D. Cal. 2002). Here, the District Judge dismissed the Third Amended Complaint with leave to amend only Plaintiff’s civil RICO claim and certain state-law claims against the PCL Defendants. (See ECF 248.) As such, even if Plaintiff amends his Complaint, the discovery sought would not relate to those claim. The Court does not, therefore, believe that there is good cause to authorize early discovery at this juncture. The Motion (ECF 241) is **denied**.

Plaintiff’s remaining Motions ask for relief that was addressed in the District Judge’s Order Accepting the Interim Report and Recommendation. Plaintiff asks the Court to rule on his Requests for judicial notice (ECF 197

#8845  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

**Case No.:** 2:23-cv-01298-JLS-BFM

**Date:** March 31, 2025

**Title:** Todd R.G. Hill v. Board of Directors of Peoples College of Law, et al.

and 199) and for reconsideration of the Interim Report and Recommendation. (ECF 237, 239). Both of these requests are moot. The Order Accepting addressed both of Plaintiff's Requests for judicial notice. (ECF 248 at 2.) Likewise, the Order Accepting specified that the District Judge reviewed both the Interim Report and Recommendation and Plaintiff's Objections. (ECF 248 at 1.) The District Judge's review and subsequent decision—filed after Plaintiff's request—therefore moots Plaintiff's request for reconsideration. Finally, Plaintiff asks for immediate ruling on his Motion to amend the Third Amended Complaint (*See* ECF 243). The Order Accepting rules on that Motion. Plaintiff's Motions (ECF 237, 239, 243) are accordingly **denied**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

cc: Todd R.G. Hill, pro se  
Counsel of record

Initials of Preparer: ch